



**EL DORADO COUNTY PLANNING SERVICES
2850 FAIRLANE COURT
PLACERVILLE, CA 95667
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Project Title: Z06-0031/S88-0016R (Sierra Pines Mobile Manor)

Lead Agency Name and Address: El Dorado County, 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

Contact Person: Tom Dougherty

Phone Number: (530) 621-5355

Property Owner's Name and Address: Anton Schu, 9461 Hwy 193 Kelsey, CA 95667

Project Engineer's Name and Address: William Rothaus, P.E., P.O. Box 406, Garden Valley, CA, 95633

Project Location: On the west side of State Highway 193 approximately 0.25 mile north of the intersection with Bayne Road in the Kelsey area.

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 088-290-17

Zoning: Estate Residential Five-Acre (RE-5)

Section: 13 **T:** 11 **R:** 10

General Plan Designation: High Density Residential (HDR)

Environmental Setting:

Located on 16.5 acre property in Kelsey area, Sierra Pines Mobile Manor is developed with 27 manufactured units and 1 four-plex unit. The site contains rolling terrain (ranging from 10% to 30% slope) with drainage towards five seasonal ponds that transverse the parcel from northwest to southeast. The soil composition consists of Mariposa (MbE) series characterized by very rocky silt loam within the range of 3 to 50% slope, moderate permeability, and suitable for woodland use. The native vegetation to the site consists of scattered ponderosa pines (*Pinus ponderosa*), foothill pines (*Pinus sabiniana*), black oaks (*Quercus kelloggii*), and annual grasses in addition to the non-native landscaping that has been installed and maintained over the years. The site is served by an internal driveways and Mobile Manor Road.

Description of Project: Request to Rezone the subject parcel from Estate Residential Five-Acre (RE-5) to Mobile Home Park (MP). Applicant further requests the addition of one new mobile home and one approximately 24' x 24' garage on an existing asphalted pad, and to remove the original formal approvals for the residential care facility and chapel.

Project Request:

1) Rezone of the property from Residential Estate 5-acre minimum (RE-5) to Mobile Home Park (MP) District. The purpose of the rezoning is to ensure consistency with its current General Plan Designation of High Density Residential (HDR). This designation allows a range of residential density from 1.5 du/ac to 5 du/ac. Along with proposed additional manufactured residence, the resulting residential unit count and density would be 32 units and 1.94 du/ac., respectively; and 2) Revision to the Special Use Permit S88-0016 allowing the installation and occupancy of a double wide, 24' x 60' manufactured residence and 2-car detached garage measuring approximately 24 feet by 24 feet. The proposed additional residence will be served by an existing domestic water well (subject to review by the Georgetown Divide Public Utility District) and on-site septic system. The proposed buildings will be constructed on an existing asphalt pad area and exceeds the required front (30'), side (30'), and rear (30') yard setbacks to the property line. The structures are 10' apart and located 60' to the intermittent pond to the south. Access to the facility and residence is off Mobile Manor Road, which connects off Highway 193 on the south end of the property. No off-site improvements are proposed for the project.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park)
Site:	RE-5	HDR	Mobilehome Park
North:	RE-5	MDR	Residential
East:	RE-5	MDR	Residential
South:	RE-5	MDR	Residential
West:	RE-10	RR	Vacant

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): California State Department of Housing Community Development; El Dorado County Development Services-Environmental Management

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources		Air Quality
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology / Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning
	Mineral Resources		Noise		Population / Housing
	Public Services		Recreation		Transportation/Traffic
	Utilities / Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance		

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect: 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards; and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described in attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects: a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, pursuant to applicable standards; and b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature: _____ Date: April 9, 2007

Printed Name: Tom Dougherty, Associate Planner For: El Dorado County

Signature: _____ Date: April 9, 2007

Printed Name: Peter Maurer, Principal Planner For: El Dorado County

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character quality of the site and its surroundings?			X
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		X	

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect to Visual Resources would result in the introduction of physical features that are not characteristic of the surrounding development, substantially change the natural landscape, or obstruct an identified public scenic vista.

a-c) **No Impacts** The senior mobile home park facility is located within the town of Kelsey along Highway 193, which is not considered a scenic highway corridor. (El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (SCH # 2001082030), May 2003, Exhibit 5.3-1 and Table 5.3-1). The area surrounding the facility primarily consists of low density residential uses on parcels ranging from 3 to 5 acres in size. As proposed, the project does not create substantial effects to the area scenic resources or visual character of the area.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The additional buildings will produce new sources of light from common residential lighting; however, given the shielding from the existing vegetation and landscaping and its proximity to the adjacent residences and parcels, impacts from these glares on day or nighttime views are anticipated to be less than significant.

Finding: No impacts from light and glare will directly result from the approval of this zone change request that do not exist today. Any future development plan would require further review against the General Plan policies and any new potential project specific impacts would be analyzed at that time. For this “Aesthetics” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Locally Important Farmland (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?			X
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?			X
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?			X

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
- The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
- Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.

- a. **Conversion of Prime Farmland.** Review of the General Plan land use map for the project area indicates that the project site is not designated as being within the Agricultural District (A) General Plan overlay and the specific land use designation is currently High Density Residential (HDR). The soil on the parcel is listed in the U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service Soil Survey list as being Mariposa very rocky silt loam (MbE) which is not classified as Statewide Important Farmland or Choice Soils. The loss of Prime Farmland will not be impacted.
- b. **Williamson Act Contract.** The project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and will not affect any properties under a Williamson Act Contract because the site is not designated for agricultural use.
- c. **Non-Agricultural Use.** The site is located in an area designated by the General Plan as Commercial and Rural Center. The impact of the conversion of the one-acre portion of this parcel that could potentially be used for agriculture to Commercial use is considered to be less than significant.

Finding: No impacts to agricultural land are expected and no mitigation is required. The rezone request is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood in that the existing use has existed since 1968. The project will continue the residential nature of the facility and the rezone will simply bring the zoning into compatibility with the general Plan Designation. For this “Agriculture” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

III. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and No_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and NO_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
 - Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- a. **Air Quality Plan.** El Dorado County has adopted the El Dorado County California Clean Air Act Plan establishing rules and standards for the reduction of stationary source air pollutants (ROG/VOC, NO_x, and O₃). This plan also contains a schedule for implementation and funding of Transportation Control Measures (TCM) to limit mobile source emissions. Implementation measures from this plan are required to be implemented at the project level and would be dealt with during the review of any future Planned Development permit. In addition, a project is required to comply with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards as required under the Federal Clean Air Act as well as the State of California Ambient Air Quality Standards, which are equal to or more stringent than the National Standards.
 - b. **Air Quality Standards.** El Dorado County is classed as being in “severe non-attainment” status for Federal and State ambient air quality standards for ozone. Additionally, the County is classified as being in “non-attainment” status for particulate matter (PM₁₀) under the State’s standards. The California Clean Air Act of 1988 requires the County’s Air Pollution Control Program to meet the State’s ambient air quality standards. The El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District administers point source air pollution control. The County requires project emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ be quantified using URBEMIS 7G or other approved model acceptable to the District. The addition of one mobile home space on an existing asphalt pad will not require additional grading. The property would be rezoned to MP but any future potential impacts to air quality would be further analyzed during the review of any future Planned Development permit.
 - c. **Ambient Air Quality.** The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District reviewed the project proposal and would again review the any future development plans and would all impacts to air quality at that time. The rezoning of the property to Mobile Home Park (MP), or the addition of one mobile home space, will not directly permanently impact air quality in a significant way.
 - d. **Sensitive Receptors.** Sensitive receptors include such groups as young children, the elderly, schools, hospitals, day-care centers, convalescent homes, and high concentrations of single-family residences. This is a senior-only park so any potential future project grading would temporarily impact that sensitive receptor during the construction phase. There could potentially be intermittent short term diesel exhaust emissions during construction but not long term. The dust temporarily kicked up during any grading and trenching stages should be controlled by any future applicant adhering to District Rules 223 and 223.1 which they are required to do. The current proposals do not include grading.
 - e. **Objectionable Odors.** The rezoning of the property to Mobile Home Park (MP) will not directly permit uses that would generate any odors. The potential uses allowed by sections 17.402.010 to 17.402.210 would not be anticipated to create objectionable odors.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Finding: A significant air quality impact is defined as any violation of an ambient air quality standard, any substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, or any exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. One mobile home will be added to an existing asphalted site. Any future development would require the submittal of a development application and the potential project specific impacts would be analyzed at that time. As discussed above, no impacts on air quality are expected and no mitigation is required. For this “Air Quality” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?		X	
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			X
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			X

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect on Biological Resources would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Substantially reduce or diminish habitat for native fish, wildlife or plants;
- Cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels;
- Threaten to eliminate a native plant or animal community;
- Reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal;
- Substantially affect a rare or endangered species of animal or plant or the habitat of the species; or
- Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.

a-b, d-f) **No Impact:** The rezoning will retain the residential use on the property that has been in affect in some part since 1968, while the proposed minor expansion, addition of one mobile home and garage onto an existing asphalt pad of existing facility will occur within an existing undeveloped, concrete pad and driveway. Future expansions or

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

development would be analyzed for their affect at that time. Therefore, the project as proposed is not anticipated to have any effects to any species or its habitat, protected wetlands, nor conflict with any local policies.

- c. **Wetlands.** The proposed mobile home and garage are located approximately 60 feet from the intermittent stream that is also a series of five drainage ponds since the project avoids wetlands and adheres to the General Plan setback requirements. There would a less then significant impact.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?			X
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?			X
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X

Discussion: In general, significant impacts are those that diminish the integrity, research potential, or other characteristics that make a historical or cultural resource significant or important. A substantial adverse effect on Cultural Resources would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Disrupt, alter, or adversely affect a prehistoric or historic archaeological site or a property or historic or cultural significant to a community or ethnic or social group; or a paleontological site except as a part of a scientific study;
- Affect a landmark of cultural/historical importance;
- Conflict with established recreational, educational, religious or scientific uses of the area; or
- Conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community where it is located.

a-d). The mobile home park has been historically utilized residentially since 1968. The proposed project will maintain the residential use of the facility, and no grading is proposed. There will be no impacts to cultural or historical resources that have not previously been analyzed by the original S 88-0016 review.

Finding: Based upon the fact that the mobile home and garage are proposed for an existing graded pad, and the rezoning to Mobile Home Park will allow uses already in progress, it is determined that the impacts on cultural resources can be anticipated to be insignificant. For this “Cultural Resources” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer		X	

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?		X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		X	
iv) Landslides?		X	
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X	
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?		X	
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risks to life or property?		X	
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?		X	

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect on Geologic Resources would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Allow substantial development of structures or features in areas susceptible to seismically induced hazards such as groundshaking, liquefaction, seiche, and/or slope failure where the risk to people and property resulting from earthquakes could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards;
 - Allow substantial development in areas subject to landslides, slope failure, erosion, subsidence, settlement, and/or expansive soils where the risk to people and property resulting from such geologic hazards could not be reduced through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards; or
 - Allow substantial grading and construction activities in areas of known soil instability, steep slopes, or shallow depth to bedrock where such activities could result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation or exposure of people, property, and/or wildlife to hazardous conditions (e.g., blasting) that could not be mitigated through engineering and construction measures in accordance with regulations, codes, and professional standards.
- a) There are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (formerly Special Studies Zone Act) in El Dorado County. No other active or potentially active faults have been mapped at or adjacent to the project site where near-field effects could occur. There would be no impact related to fault rupture. There are no known faults on the project site; however, the project site is located in a region of the Sierra Nevada foothills where numerous faults have been mapped. The project site is situated approximately 1100 feet east of the Melones fault zone. All other faults in the County, including those closest to the project site are considered inactive. (California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001, Plate 1).

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- b & c. **Soil Erosion and loss of topsoil.** All grading activities exceeding 250 cubic yards of graded material or grading completed for the purpose of supporting a structure must meet the provisions contained in the *County of El Dorado - Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* (Ordinance No. 3983, adopted 11/3/88). This ordinance is designed to limit erosion, control the loss of topsoil and sediment, limit surface runoff, and ensure stable soil and site conditions for the intended use in compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan. During any future site grading and construction of foundations and other site improvements, there is potential for erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions and that is addressed by grading permits.
- d. **Expansive soils** are those that greatly increase in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry out. The central half of the County has a moderate expansiveness rating while the eastern and western portions are rated low. These boundaries are very similar to those indicating erosion potential. When buildings are placed on expansive soils, foundations may rise each wet season and fall each dry season. This movement may result in cracking foundations, distortion of structures, and warping of doors and windows. Pursuant to the U.S.D.A. Soil Report for El Dorado County, the site has Cohasset loam (Andesite) soils. These soils are listed as having low to moderate shrink-swell potential. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code establishes a numerical expansion index for soil types ranging from very low to very high. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. There is an existing septic system that the new mobile home can hook up to and that system has been looked at by Environmental Services with no concerns. There would be an insignificant impact.

Finding: No significant geophysical impacts are expected from the rezone and addition of one mobile home either directly or indirectly. For this “Geology and Soils” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			X
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency			X

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			X

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect due to Hazards or Hazardous Materials would occur if implementation of the project would:

- Expose people and property to hazards associated with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials where the risk of such exposure could not be reduced through implementation of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
- Expose people and property to risks associated with wildland fires where such risks could not be reduced through implementation of proper fuel management techniques, buffers and landscape setbacks, structural design features, and emergency access; or
- Expose people to safety hazards as a result of former on-site mining operations.

a & b. **Hazardous Substances.** The project being considered is for rezoning of the property to Mobile Home Park (MP) which does not directly involve physical changes to the environment. There would be no impact related to the routine use, transport, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials in such quantities that would create a hazard to people or the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. **Hazardous Emissions.** The proposed rezone would not directly allow any operations that would use acutely hazardous materials or generate hazardous air emissions. Any future development proposal would be evaluated for those impacts at that time. There would be no direct impact.

d. **Hazardous Materials Sites.** The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. (California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List), http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List). No activities that could have resulted in a release of hazardous materials to soil or groundwater at the subject site are known to have occurred. There would be no direct impact with the approval of this rezone and special use permit revision request.

e. **Public Airport Hazards.** The project site is not within any airport safety zone or airport land use plan area. There would be no impact.

f. **Private Airstrip Hazards.** There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. There would be no impact.

g. **Emergency Response Plan.** The emergency response plan for any future development proposal would be analyzed for impacts at that time.

h. **Fire Hazards.** The rezone request and potential approval, would not directly allow any operations (e.g., use of hazardous materials or processes) that would substantially increase fire hazard risk under normal circumstances of

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

office usage. Emergency response access to the site and surrounding development would not be adversely affected, as discussed above.

Finding: No Hazards or Hazardous conditions are expected with the rezone request and special use permit revision and no mitigation is required. For this “Hazards” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or -off-site?			X
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			X
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			X
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect on Hydrology and Water Quality would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Expose residents to flood hazards by being located within the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- Cause substantial change in the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site ultimately causing a substantial change in the amount of water in a stream, river or other waterway;
- Substantially interfere with groundwater recharge;
- Cause degradation of water quality (temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and/or other typical stormwater pollutants) in the project area; or
- Cause degradation of groundwater quality in the vicinity of the project site.

- a. **Water Quality Standards.** The proposed development that could potentially occur because of the approval of the subject application will generate wastewater that would connect to a septic system. Stormwater runoff from potential future development is required to be directed to an engineered drainage system and to contain water quality protection features in accordance with an NPDES stormwater permit if it is deemed applicable. These requirements will be further analyzed and then conditioned specific to the future development proposal and then during the any future HCD permit process. There would be no direct impact as the pad is in and the existing drainage patterns will not be significantly changed.
- b. **Groundwater.** Potable water for any future commercial development will be analyzed has been analyzed by well permits with the County for the three existing wells. There would be no direct impact.
- c. **Erosion Control Plan.** The purpose of the erosion control program is to limit stormwater runoff and discharge from a site. The Regional Water Quality Control Board has established specific water quality objectives, and any project not meeting those objectives is required to apply for a Waste Discharge Permit. Compliance with an approved erosion control plan will reduce erosion and siltation on and off site. A grading permit through the Building Services would be required for any future development to address grading, erosion and sediment control.
- d. **Existing Drainage Pattern.** The proposed project encompasses 16.5 acres. The rate of surface runoff from potential future development site will be minimized through the HCD application review process; there would be no direct impact.
- e. **Stormwater Runoff.** . There would be no direct impact from stormwater runoff directly caused by the approval of this rezone request. Future potential impacts will be analyzed by future development application review processes.
- f. **Water Quality.** Wastewater and stormwater runoff from any future potential development would be would be analyzed further to assure water quality protection standards have been established. The project being considered is for rezoning of the property to Mobile Home Park and the addition of one mobile home and garage to an existing asphalted pad which does not directly involve major physical changes to the environment. There would be no direct impact.
- g, h and i. **Flooding.** No portion of the project is within the limits of the floodplain, as identified on the Flood Insurance Rate map, dated October 18, 1995. Therefore, no flooding impacts are expected.

FIRM. The Flood Insurance Rate Map (Panel No. 060040 0475 B, revised October 18, 1983) for the project area establishes that the project site is not within a mapped 100-year floodplain.

- j. **Inundation.** A seiche is a water wave within an enclosed body of water such as a lake or reservoir usually generated by an earthquake or landslide. A tsunami is a wave generated from earthquake activity on the ocean floor. The potential for a seiche or tsunami is considered less than significant because the project site is not located within the vicinity of a water body. A mudflow usually contains heterogeneous materials lubricated with large amounts of water often resulting from a dam failure or failure along an old stream course. The potential for a mudflow is

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

considered to be less than significant because the project site is not located within the vicinity of a dam or other water body.

Finding: Any future development plans submitted for a building permit would be analyzed by HCD to address erosion and sediment control. No development plan accompanies this rezone request. No significant hydrological impacts are expected with the project. For this “Hydrology” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

IX. LAND USE PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Physically divide an established community?			X
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?			X

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect on Land Use would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Result in the conversion of Prime Farmland as defined by the State Department of Conservation;
- Result in conversion of land that either contains choice soils or which the County Agricultural Commission has identified as suitable for sustained grazing, provided that such lands were not assigned urban or other nonagricultural use in the Land Use Map;
- Result in conversion of undeveloped open space to more intensive land uses;
- Result in a use substantially incompatible with the existing surrounding land uses; or
- Conflict with adopted environmental plans, policies, and goals of the community.

a. **Established Community.** The project site is in an area designated by the General Plan as the Kelsey Rural Center. The parcels directly to the north, south and east are designated the same as well. The project site adjoins a State highway. The rezoning of this parcel to Mobile Home Park would be in keeping with the General Plan intended development pattern and would not physically divide an established community since the use has been in existence since 1968. There would be no impact.

b. **Land Use Plan.** The General Plan designates the subject site as High Density Residential (HDR). This land use designation identifies those areas suitable for intensive single-family residential development at densities from one to five dwelling units per acre. The original Special Use Permit was approved for 26 spaces (including the owner’s) one space for a residential care facility and, four apartment units and a chapel. That previously approved density translated into 32 units for 16.5 acres making the density for the mobile home park 1.9 dwelling units/acre which conformed to the allowed density for HDR. Adding one more unit changes the density to 2 units per acre which is an acceptable level for HDR.

The current zoning designation for the site is Estate Residential Five-Acre (RE-5). Table 2.4 of the 2004 General Plan shows that this zone district is incompatible with the High Density Residential (HDR) land use designation.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

The rezone to Mobile Home Park (MP) would make the zone district designation compatible. Because the use as a mobile home park exists, there would be no change in the basic land use with the zone change to MP.

- c. **Habitat Conservation Plan.** The proposed project is not located in an area covered by a Habitat Conservation Plan. There would be no impact to rare plants with the project.

Finding: The proposed rezone to Mobile Home Park (MP) of the subject parcel will be consistent with the General Plan. The addition of one more mobile home on an existing asphalted pad will be compatible with the allowable density and. There will be no significant impact from the project due to a conflict with the General Plan. No significant impacts are expected. For this "Land Use" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?			X
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?			X

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect on Mineral Resources would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Result in obstruction of access to, and extraction of mineral resources classified MRZ-2x, or result in land use compatibility conflicts with mineral extraction operations.

- a. & b. **Mineral Resources.** The project site is not in an area where mineral resources classified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b by the State Geologist are present, (California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California, CGS Open-File Report 2000-03, 2001), and the project site has not been delineated in the General Plan or in a specific plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site. (El Dorado County Planning Department, El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), May 2003, Exhibits 5.9-6 and 5.9-7). There are no mining activities adjacent to or in the vicinity of the project site. There would be no impact.

Finding: No impacts to energy and mineral resources are expected and no mitigation is required. For this "Mineral Resources" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

XI. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i>			
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

XI. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i>			
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise level?			X
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect due to Noise would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Result in short-term construction noise that creates noise exposures to surrounding noise sensitive land uses in excess of 60dBA CNEL;
 - Result in long-term operational noise that creates noise exposures in excess of 60 dBA CNEL at the adjoining property line of a noise sensitive land use and the background noise level is increased by 3dBA, or more; or
 - Results in noise levels inconsistent with the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 in the El Dorado County General Plan.
- a. **Noise Standards.** Future construction would temporarily raise noise levels, but the proposed uses allowed in the Mobile Home Park Zone District do not inherently involve increased noise levels. Any future development project would be required not to generate noise levels exceeding the performance standards contained in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 within the General Plan.
- b. **Groundborne Noise.** Persons adjacent to the project vicinity will not be subjected to long-term, excessive groundborne noise or groundborne vibration as a result of future project construction or upon completion of the project, although short-term, intermittent impacts can be anticipated during future construction phases.
- c and d. **Ambient Noise.** The uses which would be permitted by the new Mobile Home Park Zone District designation would not typically introduce excessive noise. There could be temporary, intermittent noises from construction not untypical with any development project, but the end project would not be permitted to result in a substantial increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.
- e. **Airport Noise.** The Project is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.
- f. **Private Airstrip Noise.** The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, the project will not be subjected excessive noise from a private airport.

Finding: As discussed above, no significant noise impacts are expected with the project. For this “Noise” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (i.e., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect on Population and Housing would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Create substantial growth or concentration in population;
- Create a more substantial imbalance in the County’s current jobs to housing ratio; or
- Conflict with adopted goals and policies set forth in applicable planning documents.

a - c. **Population Growth.** The project site is in an area zoned for residential use and is essentially potentially permitted, (assuming all site constraints would be addressed), to be developed at 1-5 dwelling units per acre. This particular site however is somewhat constrained for that type of density because of the septic system leach line space reservation requirements, the road setbacks, the drainage ponds and the slope and a significant increase in population would be unlikely. The utility services and other supporting infrastructure are available at the project site and the current proposals would not displace any existing residents.

Finding: The project will not directly displace housing. There is no potential for a significant impact due to substantial growth either directly or indirectly with the project on the parcel as currently configured. For this “Population and Housing” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. <i>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</i>			
a. Fire protection?			X
b. Police protection?			X
c. Schools?			X
d. Parks?			X
e. Other government services?			X

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect on Public Services would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Substantially increase or expand the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services without increasing staffing and equipment to meet the Department’s/District’s goal of 1.5 firefighters per 1,000 residents and 2 firefighters per 1,000 residents, respectively;
- Substantially increase or expand the demand for public law enforcement protection without increasing staffing and equipment to maintain the Sheriff’s Department goal of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents;
- Substantially increase the public school student population exceeding current school capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand in services;
- Place a demand for library services in excess of available resources;
- Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 5 acres of developed parklands for every 1,000 residents; or
- Be inconsistent with County adopted goals, objectives or policies.

- a. **Fire Protection.** The Garden Valley Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. The District was solicited for comments to determine compliance with fire standards, El Dorado County General Plan, State Fire Safe Regulations as adopted by El Dorado County and the California Uniform Fire Code. The District did not respond with any concerns that the level of service would fall below the minimum requirements as a result of the proposed rezone.
- b. **Police Protection.** The project site will be served by the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department with a response time of 8 minutes to 80 percent of the population located in the Community Regions. For the rural areas, there is no standard minimum level of service or response time. Currently, the County has 0.89 sworn officers per 1,000 daytime populations. The rezoning to Mobile Home Park and addition of one mobile home and a garage, would not significantly impact current response times to the project area.
- c. **Schools.** The State allows school districts to directly levy fees on new residential and commercial/industrial development. These fees are collected at the time of building permit submittal and are designed to provide funds to acquire and construct additional facility space within impacted school districts. The rezone and addition of one mobile home will not directly generate the need for additional school facilities and will not impact school enrollment, as the project would not result in a dominant residential component.
- d. **Parks.** Section 16.12.090 of County Code establishes the method to calculate the required amount of land for dedication for parkland, and an in-lieu fee amount for the subdivision of land. Provisions to provide parkland were not included as part of the proposal in accordance with Section 16.12.090 of County Code because the project is not for a residential subdivision. The rezone will not increase the demand for parkland.
- e. **Other Facilities.** No other public facilities or services will be directly substantially impacted by the project. Any future potential impacts would be further analyzed in the in any future development application process.

Finding: As discussed above, as conditioned, no significant impacts are expected with the project either directly or indirectly. For this “Public Services” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

XIV. RECREATION.			
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Recreational Resources would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Substantially increase the local population without dedicating a minimum of 5 acres of developed parklands for every 1,000 residents; or
- Substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the area such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur.

a & b. The proposed project is for rezoning of the property to Mobile Home Park (MP) and adding a mobile home and garage on one existing asphalted pad and therefore the would not substantially contribute to an increase in demand on recreation facilities or contribute to increased use of existing facilities. There would be no impact.

Finding: No significant impacts to recreation and open space resources are expected with the rezone and revision to a special use permit. For this “Recreation” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?		X	
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?		X	
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			X
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		X	
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?		X	
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?		X	
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative		X	

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>			
transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect on Traffic would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Result in an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system;
- Generate traffic volumes which cause violations of adopted level of service standards (project and cumulative); or
- Result in, or worsen, Level of Service “F” traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county as a result of a residential development project of 5 or more units.

- a & b. **Capacity and Level of Service.** The proposed project is for rezoning of the property to Mobile Home Park and to add one mobile home and a garage. Any future development plan would be analyzed first for its impacts on the existing traffic through the initial submittal of the “Meeting Request for Initial Department of Transportation Project Review” and later potentially through a traffic study if deemed applicable. The proposal in and of itself would thus have a less than significant impact.
- c. **Traffic Patterns.** The project will not result in a major change in established air traffic patterns for publicly or privately operated airports or landing fields in the project vicinity. The project site is not within an airport safety zone. There would be no impact.
- d. **Hazards.** The project proposal will not change the existing roadways or walkways. The rezone and special use permit revision would not create a conflict with this policy.
- e. **Emergency Access.** The project site is situated on State Highway 193. Emergency access to potential future expansions would be analyzed for their impacts in relation to the particular future development proposed. There would be no direct impact.
- f. **Parking.** Section 17.18 of the Zoning Ordinance lists the parking requirements by use. The existing asphalted pad has the room for the two required parking spaces for this use. There would be no direct significant parking impacts.
- g. **Alternative Transportation.** Policies 9.1.2.4 and 9.1.2.8 direct that discretionary projects be evaluated with regard to their ability to implement, integrate and link, where possible, existing and proposed National, State, regional, County, city and local hiking, bicycle, and equestrian trails for public use. There is no bike lane proposed for State Highway 193 at this time.

Finding: As discussed above, no significant traffic impacts are expected with the project. The rezone will only permit an existing use and the addition of one mobile home space and associated garage will not cause a significant impact. For this “Transportation/Traffic” category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X
c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X

Discussion: A substantial adverse effect on Utilities and Service Systems would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Breach published national, state, or local standards relating to solid waste or litter control;
- Substantially increase the demand for potable water in excess of available supplies or distribution capacity without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide an adequate on-site water supply, including treatment, storage and distribution;
- Substantially increase the demand for the public collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased demand, or is unable to provide for adequate on-site wastewater system; or
- Result in demand for expansion of power or telecommunications service facilities without also including provisions to adequately accommodate the increased or expanded demand.

a, b & e **Wastewater.** The El Dorado County Environmental Health Division has reviewed the current application requests and their data on the current septic system and has no comments on the proposal because they determined the current system is adequate for the proposals. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. **Stormwater Drainage.** All required drainage facilities for the mobile home park are in place. The new mobile home has minor adjustments to be made to hook up. The rezoning of the property to Mobile Home Park does not directly involve physical changes to the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- d. **Potable Water.** The project proposal was reviewed by El Dorado County Environmental Health Division and they did not report any concerns with potable water issues. Until that time, impacts would be less than significant.
- f. **Landfill.** In December of 1996, direct public disposal into the Union Mine Disposal Site was discontinued and the Material Recovery Facility / Transfer Station was opened. Only certain inert waste materials (e.g., concrete, asphalt, etc.) are allowed to be dumped at the Union Mine Waste Disposal site. All other waste materials that cannot be recycled are exported to the Lockwood Regional Landfill near Sparks, Nevada. In 1997, El Dorado County signed a 30-year contract with the Lockwood Landfill Facility for continued waste disposal services. The Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity of 43 million tons over the 655-acre site. Approximately six million tons of waste was deposited between 1979 and 1993. This equates to approximately 46,000 tons of waste per year for this period. This facility has more than sufficient capacity to serve the County for the next 30 years. There would be no impact.
- g. **Solid Waste.** County Ordinance No. 4319 requires that new development provide areas for adequate, accessible, and convenient storing, collecting, and loading of solid waste and recyclables. The project is for rezoning of the property to Mobile Home Park and adding one mobile home to an existing pad. Solid waste pickup currently exists on a weekly basis for the mobile home park. There would be no impact.
- h. **Power and Telecommunication Facilities.** Power and telecommunication facilities are available at the project site. There would be no impact.

Finding: No significant utility and service system impacts are expected with the rezone and revision to a special use permit. Any new development application or expansion to what currently exists or proposed by the subject application would have the potential project specific impacts analyzed at that time. For this "Utilities and Service Systems" category, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. Does the project:			
a. Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X
b. Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X
c. Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X

Discussion:

- a. As discussed in Item V (Cultural Resources), the proposed project would have no significant effect on historical or unique archaeological resources as all facilities exist. There would be no effects on fish habitat (Item IV). There would be no significant effect on special-status plant or animal species (Item IV).

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- b. Due to the existing site specific conditions and type of project proposed and types of activities proposed, which have been disclosed in the Project Description and analyzed in Items I through XVI, there would be no significant impacts related to agriculture resources, air quality, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, land use/planning, mineral resources, population/housing, public services, recreation, traffic that would combine with similar effects such that the project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.
- c. Any future development plan that attempts to expand the current uses and those subject of this application request, would require the submittal of a development application and the potential project specific impacts would be analyzed at that time in relation to all applicable laws. There would be no environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse impacts on people either directly or indirectly.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

The following documents are available at El Dorado County Planning Services in Placerville.

El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report
Volume 1 of 3 – EIR Text, Chapter 1 through Section 5.6
Volume 2 of 3 – EIR Text, Section 5.7 through Chapter 9
Appendix A
Volume 3 of 3 – Technical Appendices B through H

El Dorado County General Plan – A Plan for Managed Growth and Open Roads; A Plan for Quality Neighborhoods and Traffic Relief (Adopted July 19, 2004)

Findings of Fact of the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors for the General Plan

El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance (Title 17 - County Code)

County of El Dorado Drainage Manual (Resolution No. 67-97, Adopted March 14, 1995)

County of El Dorado Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance (Ordinance No. 3883, amended Ordinance Nos. 4061, 4167, 4170)

El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards

El Dorado County Subdivision Ordinances (Title 16 - County Code)

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statutes (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.)

Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 3, Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (Section 15000, et seq.)